

### REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the drawings for including characters M1 and M2, which are allegedly not mentioned in the description. In response, the Examiner's attention is directed to paragraph [0033] of the present Specification, which paragraph refers to M1 and M2. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also objected to the Abstract for containing legal terms. Applicant has amended the Abstract by substituting the word "including" for the word "comprising." Accordingly, as all of the legal terms have been removed from the Abstract, withdrawal of this objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2-71084. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to disclose all of the features defined in independent Claims 1 and 10. More specifically, JP 2-71084 fails to disclose a tire wheel set wherein the front wheel is greater in rigidity than the rear wheel, and the vehicle is a *rear-drive vehicle*, as defined in amended independent Claims 1 and 10.

The object of JP 2-71084 is to improve steering performance caused by understeer in *front-wheel drive vehicles*, by using wheels lighter in weight for the rear side than for the front side, while using wheels of greater strength for the front side than for the rear side. In contrast, the object of the invention of independent Claims 1 and 10 is to improve the steering ability in *rear-wheel drive vehicles* by enhancing the capability of vibration convergence of the front wheel using a difference in rigidity between the front wheel and the

rear wheel. According to the invention of independent Claims 1 and 10, the front wheel may be lighter in weight than the rear wheel, such as in the wheel set shown in Applicant's Figure 4 and described in the corresponding portion of the current Specification, but it is a requisite that the front wheel has a larger or higher value than the rear wheel with respect to the wheel rigidity, which rigidity may be measured, for example, by the method shown in Applicant's Figure 6 and described in the corresponding portion of the current Specification.

JP 2-71084 contains absolutely no teaching about the points of the present invention mentioned above, and it completely lacks any disclosure of the technical concept of the claimed invention of making use of a difference in rigidity between the front wheel and the rear wheel. Further, JP 2-71084 relates to a front drive vehicle, while Claims 1 and 10 clearly define the present invention as being related to a rear wheel drive vehicle. In addition, because the front wheel is driven in front drive vehicles (like that in JP 2-71084), even if the front wheel is made greater in rigidity than the rear wheel, it is not possible to effectively enhance the capability of vibration convergence of the front wheel by utilizing the difference in wheel rigidity, and accordingly, JP 2-71084 does not even suggest the invention defined in Claim 1 and 10. Thus for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this §102(b) rejection of independent Claims 1 and 10 under JP 2-71084.

Claims 2, 8, 11 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over JP 2-71084. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 2 and 8 both depend from independent Claim 1, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 1, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully


requests that the §103 rejection of dependent Claims 2 and 8 be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 1, and also because JP 2-71084 fails to suggest the claimed invention.

Claims 11 and 17 are independent Claims that include the same features argued above with regard to the §102(b) rejection of independent Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least those reasons, and also because JP 2-71084 fails to suggest the claimed invention of Claims 11 and 17, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of Claims 11 and 17.

For all of the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

James K. Folker

Registration No. 37,538

July 31, 2007  
Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978  
P:\DOCS\4386\77653\BT2936.DOC